

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for reviewing and considering the present application. The Office Action dated November 6, 2006 has been received and reviewed. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 4-6 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0 889 556, issued to *Douty et al.* (hereinafter "*Douty*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4 recites a laundry dryer control panel comprising, inter alia, "a terminal block disposed within the laundry dryer control, the terminal block including a back portion placed on the control panel" and "a wall extending below the terminal block bottom part and above the terminal block uppermost part; a first wire extending out of the terminal block bottom part; and a second wire extending out of the terminal block uppermost part wherein the wall extends from the terminal block such that the wall shields portions of exposed cores of the first wire and the second wire."

Applicants submit that *Douty* fails to disclose at least the above-mentioned features recited in claim 4. For example, *Douty* does not disclose that a terminal block is disposed "within" the laundry dryer control or that the terminal block includes a "back portion placed on the control panel." In contrast, *Douty* discloses a terminal block 10 mounted in a cut out of a panel 150. See *Douty* at column 2, lines 47-50. However, *Douty*'s panel 150 is not a control panel.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that *Douty* does not disclose or suggest at least a wall extending below the terminal block bottom part and above the terminal block uppermost part, wherein "the wall extends from the terminal block such that the wall shields portions of exposed cores of the first wire and the second wire."

In setting forth the rejection, the Office identifies termination site 20, skirt 22, and end wall 26 as being the claimed wall. See page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully disagree. As illustrated in Figure 1, *Douty* discloses that the terminal block 10 includes the termination site 20, skirt 22, and end wall 26. See *Douty* at column 2, lines 47-55. However, the termination site 20, skirt 22, and end wall 26 cannot be the wall, as claimed, because none of these features extend below the terminal block bottom part and above the terminal block uppermost part, as required by the claim.

Furthermore, *Douty* fails to disclose that the first and second wires include “exposed cores.” According to the Examiner, the terminals, internal wires, and ring tongue sections of *Douty* are the claimed “portions of exposed cores.” Again, Applicants disagree, as these features of *Douty* do not extend above an uppermost portion of the terminal block or below a bottom portion of the terminal block, as required by the claim. See *Douty* at column 5, lines 9-20 and Figure 5.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is patentable and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 5-6 and 9-10, which depend from claim 4, are also patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Claims 1, 3, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,742,708, issued to *McCormick*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,030,802, issued to *Lennon et al.* (hereinafter *Lennon*). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a structure comprising at least “a terminal block provided on an inside of the control panel, wherein the terminal block comprises a back portion placed on the control panel and a front portion having a wall configured for shielding parts exposing a core of a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front portion and below a bottom portion of the front portion.”

McCormick fails to disclose at least the above-mentioned features. Moreover, *Lennon* fails to cure the deficiencies of *McCormick*. In this regard, *Lennon* fails to disclose or suggest, inter alia, a wall that is configured for shielding parts exposing a core of a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front portion and below a bottom portion of the front portion. To the extent the Office alleges that bottom plate 47 of *Lennon* is the claimed wall, Applicants submit that bottom plate 47 cannot be the claimed wall because it, inter alia, does not extend below a bottom portion of the front portion of the terminal block, as required by claim 1.

Additionally, *Lennon* fails to disclose or suggest, inter alia, a core of a wire being exposed. Further, *Lennon* fails to disclose or suggest, inter alia, a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front portion and below a bottom portion of the front portion, as recited in claim 1. In contrast, *Lennon* discloses leads 35 (i.e., insulated electrical conductors) and not exposed cores of a wire. See *Lennon* at column 7, lines 3-12, as well as Figures 1 and 2. As *Lennon* fails to disclose exposing a core of a wire, *Lennon* cannot possibly fails to disclose “a wall configured for shielding parts exposing a core of a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front portion and below a bottom portion.”

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the claimed recitation “configured for” is considered to be met in *Lennon* because it can be seen from Figures 2, 3, and 5 that the wall is configured for the intended use of the claim. Applicants respectfully disagree. Figures 2, 3, and 5 of *Lennon* do not illustrate exposing a core of a wire. Thus, Figures 2, 3, and 5 cannot illustrate exposing a core of a wire extending above an uppermost portion and below a bottom portion. Still further, the text in *Lennon* corresponding to Figures 2, 3, and 5 make no mention of exposed wire cores. As such, Figures 2, 3, and 5 of *Lennon* do not disclose the so-called intended use of the wall (i.e., shielding parts exposing a core of a wire)

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out with specificity these alleged features in *McCormick, Lennon, and Sergeant*, as Applicants can find no such teaching in these applied references, taken alone or in combination. For example, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out with specificity, where any of the applied references disclose a wall configured for shielding parts exposing a core of a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front portion and below a bottom portion of the front portion, as recited.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 3 and 7-8, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *McCormick*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,010,996, issued to *Hopkins*, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,820,189, issued to *Sergeant et al* (hereinafter *Sergeant*). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 recites the features of claim 1 including “a terminal block provided on an inside of the control panel, wherein the terminal block comprises a back portion placed on the control panel and a front portion having a wall configured for shielding parts exposing a core of a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front portion and below a bottom portion of the front portion of the terminal block.”

As discussed above, *McCormick* fails to disclose at least the above-mentioned features. Moreover, *Hopkins* fails to cure the deficiencies of *McCormick*. For example, *Hopkins* does not disclose “parts exposing a core of a wire” extending above an upper portion of the front portion of a terminal block. Moreover, it is unclear what teachings of *Hopkins* are being relied upon in the rejection of the claims.

In addition, Applicants submit that *Sergeant* fails to cure the deficiencies of *McCormick* and *Hopkins*. More specifically, *Sergeant* does not disclose, inter alia, “parts exposing a core of

a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front portion and below a bottom portion of the front portion.”

In setting forth the rejection, the Office relies upon *Sergeant* at column 4 lines 1-12, which describes the embodiment depicted in Figure 1B. In addition, the Office also relies upon Figures 2-5, which relates to a different embodiment. Although Applicants submit that these citations of *Sergeant* fail to disclose or suggest the claimed combination of features, Applicants also submit that it is inappropriate to combine the teachings of different embodiments without motivation or suggestion in the references themselves.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is patentable over the applied references, taken alone or in combination, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicants' representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 5, 2007

By Michael J. Wagner (Reg. No. 46,522)
for **Mark R. Kresloff**
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant